

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Schmid, et al. (US Patent No. 5,659,164). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As previously amended, claims 1 and 8 required that the method locate "a control image on a control sheet...wherein *the control sheet* could be located anywhere within the imaging job." In his arguments, the Examiner restated his arguments from the final rejection prior to the request for continued examination. For example, on page 7 of the action, the Examiner states, "that claimed features of 'the control image could be anywhere in the imaging job'..." The Examiner did not address Applicants' amendment that required that *control sheets* be located anywhere within the imaging job. The Applicants argued that Schmid does not show that control sheets can be located anywhere within an imaging job, only that a control image may be located in one of four places on a control sheet that must be located as the first sheet in the job.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to more clearly show that at least one sheet in the imaging job is a control sheet, and that the control sheet can be located anywhere in the imaging job. As the Examiner did not address Applicants' amendment or the arguments directed to those amendments, Applicants specifically request that the Examiner consider them in his response to the amendment.

With regard to claims 2 and 9, Schmid does not teach the limitations of having the control sheets located anywhere within the imaging job, Schmid cannot teach the further limitations of claims 2 and 9, wherein the imaging job is an image acquisition task, nor claims 3 and 11 wherein the imaging job is an image production task. Applicants note that the Examiner refers to claim 10, which had been previously canceled. Therefore, Applicants

submit that claims 2, 3, 9 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of this claim.

With regard to claims 4, 5, 12 and 13, Applicants submit that Schmid does not teach the control image being located on a control sheet, where the control sheet is located anywhere in the imaging job, much less that the control image be machine-readable code or text. Applicants therefore submit that claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims.

With regard to claims 7 and 15, Applicants submit that as Schmid does not teach the limitation of having a control sheet located anywhere in the imaging job, Schmid cannot teach, show, nor suggest having a second control image on a second control sheet, as is required by claims 7 and 15. The new document cover sheets in Schmid are also required to be in the first position. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and request allowance of these claims.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, PC  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613